



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/782,229

02/19/2004

Philip A. Bernstein

MSFT-2911/115152.02

5212

41505

7590

04/30/2008

WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)

CIRA CENTRE, 12TH FLOOR

2929 ARCH STREET

PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-2891

EXAMINER

FLEURANTIN, JEAN B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2162

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/30/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/782,229	Applicant(s) BERNSTEIN ET AL.	
	Examiner JEAN B. FLEURANTIN	Art Unit 2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02/08/2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 76-84 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 76-84 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is in response to the application filed on 02/08/2008.

The following is the status of claims:

Claims 1-75 and 85-93 have been canceled.

Claims 76-84 remain pending for examination.

Response to Arguments

After further review of the application and applicant's amendment filed on 02/08/2008, a new ground(s) of 35 U.S.C. § 112 second paragraph and 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection of claims 76-78 are made. Therefore, the 35 U.S.C. rejection maintains.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Preamble(s) of the independent claims 76 and 82 recite "*a method for prefetching data for a set of objects*" and "*a system for prefetching data for a set of objects*", wherein the preambles do not tie with the body of the claim(s), which render(s) the claim(s) indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 76-78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

As set forth in MPEP 2106:

As per independent claim 76

The independent claim 76 is directed to a *method*, in which prefetching data for a set of objects. Therefore, the mechanism for identifying the type of scalar value for the attribute, the type of relationship defined by the attribute as the purpose of the invention. The claimed subject matter lacks a practical application of a judicial exception (law of nature, abstract idea, naturally occurring article/phenomenon) since it fails to produce a useful and tangible result.

Dependent claims are rejected under the same rational.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 76-84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPTNo. 5,765,159 issued to Srinivasan ("Srinivasan") in view of USPTNo. 5,317,727 issued to Tsuchida et al., ("Tsuchida").

Art Unit: 2162

As per claim 76, Srinivasan discloses “a method for prefetching data for a set of objects, each object in the set comprising a plurality of attributes” (i.e., retrieving from dbms all attributes for the object; see col. 6, lines 30-32) comprising:

“prior to receiving a query” (see col. 8, lines 29-30), “creating a structure context description that identifies each object in the set of objects” (In light the specification at paragraph [0017], the purposed of creating a structure context is for associating that structure context description with every object in the structure. The method of creating a new path whose attribute (object) value matches the current path is disclosed by Srinivasan col. 10, lines 40-56);

“associating the structure context description with each object in the set of objects” (i.e., set of columns mapping to the base attributes (objects); see col. 5, lines 10-12); and

“receiving from an application the query that requests data corresponding to a first attribute of a first object in the set of objects” (i.e., receiving the original object query; see col. 8, lines 29-31); and

“in response to receiving the query” (i.e., responding to an object query; see col. 7, lines 36-37);

“retrieving data corresponding to the first attribute of the first object” (i.e., query retrieving only base attributes object; see col. 6, lines 29-32);

“returning the data corresponding to the first attribute of the first object to the application” (i.e., retrieving the data from relational database as a result of executing the object query; see col. 6, lines 32-35);

“using the structure context description to identify data corresponding to the first attribute of other objects in the set of objects” (i.e., using schema mapping information; see col. 10, lines 49-56);

“retrieving the data corresponding to the first attribute of the other objects in the set of objects” (see col. 11, lines 34-40 and Fig. 8).

Srinivasan fails to explicitly disclose the structure context description reduces time required to process the query after the query is received; and placing in cache the data corresponding to the first attribute of the other objects in the set of objects for future use. However, Tsuchida discloses the structure context description reduces time required to process the query after the query is received (see Tsuchida col. 3, lines 32-39); and placing in cache the data corresponding to the first attribute of the other

Art Unit: 2162

objects in the set of objects for future use (see Tsuchida col. 5, lines 27-34 and col. 6, lines 2-5). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Srinivasan by reducing time required to process the query after the query is received; and placing in cache the data corresponding to the first attribute of the other objects in the set of objects for future use as disclosed by Tsuchida (see Tsuchida col. 6, lines 5-20). Such a modification would allow the method of Srinivasan to provide a database processing method, where useless prefetching operation is omitted, and the necessary data is surely prefetched so as to reduce the input/output processing time, so that the performance of the overall system can be improved (see Tsuchida col. 3, lines 25-31), therefore, improving the accuracy and the reliability of the prefetching and caching persistent objects.

As per claim 77, in addition to claim 76, Srinivasan further discloses “memory of a client application program, memory allocated to a data storage system” (i.e., computer program, residing in a memory; see col. 3, lines 46-50), and “a table of a relational database” (i.e., relational table; see col. 5, lines 10-16).

As per claim 78, in addition to claim 76, Srinivasan further discloses “retrieving by an object repository the data corresponding to the first attribute of the other objects in the set of objects” (i.e., retrieving attributes objects; see col. 6, lines 58-60).

As per claim 79, the limitations of claim 79 are similar to claim 76, therefore, the limitations of claim 79 are rejected in the analysis of claim 76, and this claim is rejected on that basis.

As per claims 80 and 81, the limitations of claims 80 and 81 are similar to claims 77 and 78, therefore, the limitations of claim 80 and 81 are rejected in the analysis of claims 77 and 78, and these claims are rejected on that basis.

Art Unit: 2162

As per claim 82, in addition to claim 76, Srinivasan further discloses "a processor operative to execute computer executable instructions: and memory having stored therein computer executable instruction" (i.e., computer system includes one or more processors, a main memory and computer programs which residing in the main memory executed by the processors in the computer system; see col. 3, lines 35-49 and Fig. 2).

As per claims 83 and 84, the limitations of claims 83 and 84 are similar to claims 77 and 78, therefore, the limitations of claim 83 and 84 are rejected in the analysis of claims 77 and 78, and these claims are rejected on that basis.

Art Unit: 2162

CONTACT INFORMATION

2. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JEAN B. FLEURANTIN whose telephone number is 571 – 272-4035. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:05 to 4:35.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, JOHN E BREENE can be reached on 571 – 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/JEAN B. FLEURANTIN/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2162